

Cumulative Table of Cases

Connecticut Reports

Volume 328

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

A Better Way Wholesale Autos, Inc. v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles	245
<i>Administrative appeal; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that there was lack of substantial evidence in record to support finding that plaintiff violated statute (§ 14-54) that required it to obtain certificate of approval from local authorities for certain location where it displayed motor vehicles; appeal dismissed on ground that certification improvidently granted.</i>	
Bouchard v. State Employees Retirement Commission.	345
<i>Administrative appeal; declaratory judgment; class action; claim that trial court improperly determined that no time limitation applied for plaintiffs, retired state employees, to initiate their claims for recalculation of their retirement benefits pursuant to decision in Longley v. State Employees Retirement Commission (284 Conn. 149); claim that trial court improperly determined that plaintiffs' claims accrued when Longley was decided; claim that it was improper, in absence of statutory or regulatory time limitation for commencing action seeking to enforce duty created by statute, to apply analogous statute of limitations; whether rule permitting use of analogous statute of limitations was applicable to administrative proceedings; whether trial court properly determined that tolling mechanism of continuing violation theory was not applicable to plaintiffs' claim; whether continuous course of conduct doctrine applied to toll accrual of causes of action.</i>	
Bozelko v. Statewide Construction, Inc. (Order)	907
Brooks v. Powers	256
<i>Negligence; summary judgment; governmental immunity; claim that negligence of defendant town constables in responding to report that woman was standing in field during severe thunderstorm, possibly in need of medical attention, was proximate cause of woman's accidental drowning next morning; whether Appellate Court improperly determined that genuine issues of material fact existed as to whether defendants' conduct fell within identifiable person, imminent harm exception to governmental immunity; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that woman's drowning fell within scope of risk created by defendants' failure to immediately investigate report that woman was standing in field during storm, possibly in need of medical attention; whether woman's drowning was too attenuated from risk of harm created by storm for jury reasonably to conclude that it was storm related or imminent; whether woman's drowning in body of water one-half mile away from field many hours after she was observed in field was foreseeable harm.</i>	
Burke v. Mesniaeff (Order).	901
Colon v. Commissioner of Correction (Order).	907
Connecticut Housing Finance Authority v. Alfaro.	134
<i>Foreclosure; attorney's fees; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly denied defendant's statutory (§ 42-150bb) motion for attorney's fees; whether § 42-150bb permits award of attorney's fees when commercial party withdraws action as of right pursuant to statute (§ 52-80) in response to defense mounted by consumer; claim that withdrawal of action pursuant to § 52-80 constitutes successful defense under § 42-150bb.</i>	
Cuozzo v. Orange (Order)	906
Doe v. West Hartford	172
<i>Summary judgment; reliance on statute (§ 52-593a) that operates to render action timely commenced if process to be served is personally delivered to marshal within limitation period and process is served within thirty days of delivery; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court improperly concluded that requirement in § 52-593a (b) that marshal endorse on return of service date on which process was delivered to him was directory rather than</i>	

<i>mandatory; claim that Appellate Court improperly reversed trial court's decision to grant defendants' motions for summary judgment on ground that admissible evidence properly before trial court was sufficient to create genuine issue of material fact concerning whether plaintiff had delivered process to marshal within applicable limitation period.</i>	
Glastonbury v. Metropolitan District Commission	326
<i>Declaratory judgment; whether defendant quasi-municipal water company unlawfully imposed surcharges on plaintiff town; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law.</i>	
Griswold v. Camputaro (Order)	904
Harnage v. Lightner	248
<i>Civil action against state employees; service of process; personal jurisdiction; motion to dismiss; dismissal of claims against defendants in their individual capacities on ground that plaintiff did not properly serve them pursuant to statute (§ 52-57 [a]) governing service of process in civil actions; dismissal of claims against defendants in their official capacities on ground that plaintiff did not post recognizance bond pursuant to statute ([Rev. to 2013] §§ 52-185 and 52-186); remand of case to trial court by Appellate Court to determine whether plaintiff was entitled to waiver of recognizance bond requirement; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial court properly had dismissed plaintiff's action against defendants in their individual capacities for lack of personal jurisdiction; mootness of issue of whether trial court properly dismissed plaintiff's claims against defendants in their official capacities on basis of plaintiff's failure to post recognizance bond.</i>	
In re Damian G. (Order)	902
In re Jacob W. (Order)	902
Jones v. State	84
<i>Petition for new trial based on newly discovered DNA evidence; whether new evidence satisfied fourth element for granting petition for new trial under Asherman v. State (202 Conn. 429) because it would probably produce different result in new trial; certification from Appellate Court; claim that Appellate Court should have engaged in de novo review of whether new evidence was likely to produce different result; whether traditional considerations for applying abuse of discretion standard of review were implicated in present case when judge deciding petition for new trial did not preside at petitioner's criminal trial and parties agreed that new jury would credit new DNA evidence; claim that statute (§ 52-270) that authorizes petitions for new trial limited appellate court's review to determining whether trial court had abused its discretion; whether new evidence proved that it was less likely that petitioner had touched jacket that witness purportedly saw him discard after shooting; whether lack of DNA match between petitioner and hairs found in victim's car would lead to different result at new trial.</i>	
Kirby of Norwich v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act	38
<i>Unemployment compensation; whether members of plaintiff's sales force who engaged in door-to-door sales of plaintiff's products were employees of plaintiff or independent contractors under Unemployment Compensation Act (§ 31-222 et seq.); whether trial court correctly determined that plaintiff failed to establish that sales representatives were customarily engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for plaintiff, as required by part C of ABC test, as set forth in § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (I), (II) and (III), which governs determination of whether services performed by individual constitute employment; claim that trial court interpreted § 31-222 (a) (1) (B) (ii) (III) too narrowly and incorrectly concluded that sales representatives were plaintiff's employees; whether trial court properly dismissed appeals from decisions of defendant Employment Security Board of Review; failure of plaintiff to present evidence of factors that court may consider under totality of circumstances test for evaluating dynamics of relationship between putative employee and employer; claim that this court should reconsider and overrule prior case law holding that part C of ABC test is satisfied only if putative employee is actually engaged in independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of same nature as that involved in service performed for putative employer.</i>	
Martinez v. New Haven	1
<i>Negligent supervision; claim, pursuant to statute (§ 52-557n), that defendant city and defendant board of education were negligent in failing to properly supervise</i>	

<i>students in auditorium; whether trial court improperly determined that plaintiff schoolchild, who at school during school hours, satisfied imminent harm to identifiable persons exception to governmental immunity; whether plaintiff failed to satisfy imminent harm prong of that exception because he failed to prove that it was apparent to defendants that claimed dangerous condition, namely, students running with safety scissors, was so likely to cause harm that clear and unequivocal duty to act immediately was created; claim that defendants failed to plead governmental immunity as special defense in operative answer; whether trial court, which never expressly ruled on defendants' request to amend their answer to include governmental immunity as special defense, implicitly granted request to amend answer and overruled objection thereto.</i>	
Meletrich v. Commissioner of Correction (Order)	908
O'Brien v. New Haven (Orders)	909
Ridgaway v. Mount Vernon Fire Ins. Co.	60
<i>Insurance; action to recover damages for defendant's refusal to provide coverage under insurance policy it issued to its insured, which had assigned its rights in policy to plaintiffs as part of settlement agreement in related action; motion for nonsuit based on plaintiffs' failure to comply with discovery order; motion to open judgment of nonsuit; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court incorrectly determined that trial court had abused its discretion in rendering judgment of nonsuit for counsel's failure to comply with order of court; claim that Appellate Court improperly applied proportionality test that applies only to sanctions for violations of discovery orders; whether judgment of nonsuit was proportionate sanction in light of entirety of factual findings; remand for trial court to conduct hearing on sanctions.</i>	
Rockwell v. Rockwell (Order)	902
St. Juste v. Commissioner of Correction	198
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to advise petitioner of immigration consequences of pleading guilty to assault in second degree; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that petitioner's appeal from trial court's denial of habeas petition was moot; whether, in light of petitioner's deportation during pendency of appeal, any practical relief could be provided in connection with assault conviction; whether petitioner's prior conviction of threatening in second degree constituted crime of moral turpitude barring petitioner's reentry into country; collateral consequences doctrine, discussed.</i>	
Spencer v. Spencer (Order)	903
State v. Azevedo (Order)	908
State v. Grant (Order)	910
State v. Jackson (Order)	910
State v. Johnson (Order)	905
State v. Josephs	21
<i>Cruelty to animals; claim that statute (§ 53-247 [a]) prohibiting person from unjustifiably injuring animal requires proof that defendant had specific intent to injure animal; whether trial court properly concluded that § 53-247 (a) required only general intent to engage in conduct in question; claim that § 53-247 (a) was unconstitutionally vague as applied to defendant's conduct; whether defendant's conduct clearly came within unmistakable core of conduct prohibited under § 53-247 (a); whether evidence was sufficient to convict defendant pursuant to § 53-247 (a).</i>	
State v. Neary (Order)	901
State v. Panek	219
<i>Voyeurism; whether Appellate Court properly upheld trial court's dismissal of charges; whether video voyeurism statute (§ 53a-189a [a] [1]) that requires victim to be not in plain view refers to plain view of defendant or plain view of public generally; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly determined that § 53a-189a (a) (1) plainly and unambiguously referred to plain view of defendant; whether legislature intended not in plain view to refer to plain view of public generally; claim that ambiguity in § 53a-189a (a) (1) should be resolved in defendant's favor under rule of lenity; claim that § 53a-189a (a) (1) was unconstitutionally vague on its face and as applied to defendant's conduct.</i>	
State v. Smith (Order)	906
State v. Stanley (Order)	907

U.S. Bank National Assn., Trustee <i>v.</i> Blowers (Order)	904
Valliere <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Social Services	294
<i>Administrative appeal; application for Medicaid benefits; whether trial court properly sustained appeal from decision upholding denial of spousal support allowance; claim that preexisting spousal support order issued by Probate Court pursuant to statute (§ 45a-655 [b] and [d]) was binding on Commissioner of Social Services in connection with calculation of certain Medicaid benefits; statutory (§ 17b-261b) right of commissioner to intervene in certain Probate Court proceedings, discussed.</i>	
Wiederman <i>v.</i> Halpert (Order)	906